

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
CHARLESTON DIVISION

Michael Patrick Wahl,	)	
	)	
Petitioner,	)	Civil Action No. 2:13-1344-TMC
	)	
vs.	)	<b>ORDER</b>
	)	
Warden Kenny Atkinson,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	
_____	)	

Petitioner, proceeding pro se and *in forma pauperis*, filed this petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02, D.S.C., this matter was referred to a magistrate judge for pretrial handling. Before the court is the magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation (“Report”), recommending that the action be dismissed for lack of prosecution. (ECF No. 22). Petitioner was advised of his right to file objections to the Report. (ECF No. 22 at 2). However, has not filed objections and the time to do so has now run.

The Report has no presumptive weight and the responsibility to make a final determination in this matter remains with this court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). In the absence of objections, this court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the Report. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). Rather, “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

After a thorough review of the record in this case, including an independent search on the Federal Bureau of Prisons' inmate locator to ensure the magistrate judge's orders were sent to the correct address, the court adopts the Report (ECF No. 22) and incorporates it herein. Accordingly, this action is **DISMISSED** with prejudice for failure to prosecute pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) and the factors outlined in *Chandler Leasing Corp. v. Lopez*, 669 F.2d 919, 920 (4th Cir. 1982). *See Ballard v. Carlson*, 882 F.2d 93 (4th Cir. 1989). In addition, Respondent's motion to dismiss (ECF No. 13) is **TERMINATED** as moot.

A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find both that his constitutional claims are debatable and that any dispositive procedural rulings by the district court are also debatable or wrong. *See Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 336 (2003); *Rose v. Lee*, 252 F.3d 676, 683 (4th Cir. 2001). In the instant matter, the court finds that Petitioner has failed to make "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." Accordingly, the court declines to issue a certificate of appealability.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Timothy M. Cain  
United States District Judge

January 6, 2014  
Anderson, South Carolina

#### **NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this order pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.